



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/608,010

06/30/2003

Masaya Ichikawa

TSM-33

1951

7590

06/08/2006

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD, SUITE 370
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

RIAD, AMINE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2113

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/608,010

Applicant(s)

ICHIKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Amine Riad

Art Unit

2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers


- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 6/30/2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-13 are presented for examination.

Claims 1-13 are rejected.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 10 and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1, in line 15 the word uni8t needs to be changed to unit.

Claim 10, in lines 9 and 15 recites processing of acquiring. Processing of acquiring needs to be changed to **a process of acquiring** as a suggestion from the Examiner.

Claim 11, in lines 4 and 10 recites processing of acquiring. Processing of acquiring needs to be changed to **a process of acquiring** as a suggestion from the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because both claim 10 and 11 need to recite a **computer readable** storage medium instead of a storage medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2113

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10,11, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyamoto US Patent 5,845,061.

In regard to claims 1, 9,10, 11and 13,

Miyamoto discloses a server system comprising a plurality of servers that can be each operated as a primary system and a standby system by system switching, (Figure 1; items 101 server of execution system and 102 server of fault auxiliary system) also (Column 9; line 10-13 [server of fault auxiliary system is standby until a fault occurs at the server of execution system]) and a shared disk unit for storing data accessed by said plurality of servers, (Figure 1; item 106) wherein each or said plurality of servers comprises:

- An application means; (Column 4; line 50 “ the present invention to provide a client server alternation” [client-server inherently comprises application means to serve the client])
- A driver means that: acquires information on a configuration inside said shared disk unit after starting of said system;(Figure 1; items 109 and 111) and (Column 10; lines 5-8 [when a fault happens among the information handed over (from the server 101 to server 102) is information collected from shared disk 106 by item 109. This information includes the file system structure, and log of number of times of access at the time of occurrence of a fault. This is considered as configuration information]) Based on said configuration information, sets said shared disk unit in an active state in which an access request to said shared disk

Art Unit: 2113

unit can be sent, and when the driver means receives an access request to said shared disk unit, sends said access request to said shared disk unit; (Column 9; line 63-65 [process admin 108 always monitors the disk processor 109 to check if a fault has occurred or not this is interpreted as item 109 is the one that sets shared disk 106 to active when there is no fault, and sends the requests in this case])

- An access control means that (Figure 1; items 108 and 110)
- Judges whether an access request issued by said application means should be sent, based on a management table indicating inhibited types of access requests for each access destination; (Figure 1; item 108) and (Column 5; lines 15-19)
- and sends said access request to said driver means when said access request is not inhibited for an access destination of said access request (Column 5; lines 19-21)

In regard to claim 2,

Miyamoto discloses the server system according to claim 1, wherein:

when a fault occurs in a server operating as the primary system, (Column 4; lines 49-52) then the access control means of said server registers in said management table such that an access request of said application means to any access destination is inhibited (Column 5; line 16-17 [when the state registering table registers the state of

Art Unit: 2113

the disc processor 109 when a fault occurs the state table inhibits the access to the shared disc through item 109]).

In regard to claim 5,

Miyamoto discloses the server system according to claim 1, wherein:

- management table indicates an inhibited read and/or write access request for each access destination; (Column 14; lines 10-12[reading or writing data in accordance with the request which comes from the processor administrator that contains the administrative table means that the administrative table contains either an inhibited read or write]).

access control means judges, based on said management table, whether a read or write access request issued by said application means should be sent , and sends the read or write access request to said driver means when said access request is directed to an access destination for which the read or write access request is not inhibited (Column 14; lines 6-12 ["In accordance with the request" is considered as checking for the conditions of access]).

In regard to claim 6,

Miyamoto discloses the server system according to claim 1, wherein:

- management table indicates an inhibited file open and/or file close access request for each access destination; (Column 19; lines 28-35 [when a file is
-

Art Unit: 2113

locked it is inhibited from being accessed by other processes therefore both its opening, and its closing are inhibited])

- access control means judges, based on said management table, whether a file open or file close access request issued by said application means should be sent (Column 5; lines 15-19), and sends the file open or file close access request to said driver means when said access request is directed to an access destination for which the file open or file close access request is not inhibited (Column 5; lines 19-21).

In regard to claim 12,

Miyamoto discloses the storage medium according to claim 11 in which the program functions as an operating system. (Column 19; lines 24-27)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto US Patent 5,845,061 in view of Padmanabhan Patent Application Publication 2004/0107300.

In regard to claim 3,

Art Unit: 2113

Miyamoto discloses the server system according to parent claim 1, which when it operates as a primary server, and receives a switching command the access control registers in the management table inhibited destination (Column 11; lines 4-6 the switching happens only when a fault occurs therefore by updating the state administrative table Miyamoto inhibits the access of the application to any destination) Miyamoto does not disclose that the server system comprises a console for sending to the plurality of servers a system switching command inputted by an operator.

Padmanabhan teaches a console for sending to the plurality of servers a system switching command inputted by an operator (Page 5; paragraph 113)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a console for sending to the plurality of servers a switching command inputted by an operator of Padmanabhan into the server system of Miyamoto.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention would have been motivated to make this combination because adding manual switching would make the system more flexible, allowing an operator to switch from one server to the other at anytime for maintenance purposes for example.

In regard to claim 7,

Miyamoto discloses receiving the command for registering, deleting or changing inhibited access requests for each access destination; and registering the deleting command, the changing command, and the registering command in the management table (Column 19; lines 34-40) and (Figure 30; item 84 update file administration

Art Unit: 2113

information updating file administration information is interpreted as registering, deleting, and changing).

- Miyamoto does not disclose a server system that comprises a console for sending said plurality of servers a command by an operator.
- Padmanabhan teaches a console for sending to the plurality of servers a command for registering, deleting or changing inhibited access requests by an operator. (Page 5; paragraph 113)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a console for sending to the plurality of servers a command for registering, deleting or changing inhibited access requests by an operator by Padmanabhan into the server system of Miyamoto.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention would have been motivated to make this combination because adding manual switching would make the system more flexible, allowing an operator to switch from one server to the other at anytime for maintenance purposes for example.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto US Patent 5,845,061 in view of Raz US Patent 5,913,227.

In regard to claim 4,

Miyamoto discloses the server system as recited in parent claim 1.

Miyamoto does not disclose that at least write is inhibited from management table by the access control means.

Art Unit: 2113

Raz teaches in (Column 5; lines 65-67) and (Column 6; lines 1-5) that the agent makes a determination by referring to a locally maintained table in which the agent records the granting and the release of locks per file. Raz teaches also that a shared lock can be granted and the new file access request is a read only not a write request.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine inhibiting write request from the management table by the access control means as taught by Raz with the server system of Miyamoto.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention would have been motivated to make this combination because writing to the shared disk while recovering from a fault occurring in the master server could corrupt the data existing in the shared disk.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto US Patent 5,845,061 in view of Odanaka JP 05241876.

In regard to claim 8,

Miyamoto discloses the server system as recited in parent claim 1,

Miyamoto does not disclose a console for sending each of said plurality of servers a command that is inputted by an operator and that requests contents of the management table, and for outputting the contents of the management table received from the server in question.

Odanaka teaches sending a command that is inputted by an operator and outputting the content of the management table (Abstract; "and the table is outputted to a console")

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a console for sending to the plurality of servers a command for outputting the content of management table by an operator by Odanaka into the server system of Miyamoto.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention would have been motivated to make this combination because manually outputting the content of the management table would give the system an additional option to view the data.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Patent 6,748,554 teaches most of the limitations, but misses an important element which is the management table, on the other hand U.S. patent 7,028,218 contains some elements, but lacks an important element which is driver means to acquire configuration inside the shared disk. See PTO 892.

Contact


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amine Riad whose telephone number is 571-272-8185. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on 571-272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2113

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AR
Amine Riad
Patent Examiner


ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Application/Control Number: 10/608,010
Art Unit: 2113

Page 12